

2 copies
stock

JPRS: 3483

6 July 1960

INDEXED TO MAIN FILE

THE SOVIET UNION -- CHIEF SUPPORT OF PEACE-LOVING HUMANITY

DNIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19990112 127

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from:

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
205 EAST 42ND STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

**Reproduced From
Best Available Copy**

F O R E W A R D

This publication was prepared under contract by the UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE, a federal government organization established to service the translation and research needs of the various government departments.

JPRS: 3483

CSO: 3983-D

THE SOVIET UNION -- CHIEF SUPPORT OF PEACE-LOVING HUMANITY

Following is a translation of an unsigned article in the Russian-language periodical Kommunist (Communist), Moscow, No. 8, May 1960, pages 13-23.

The four-power Paris conference of heads of state, which was to have been an important milestone on the route to further weakening of international tension, was torpedoed by reactionary groups in the United States of America. The outrageous intrusion of the USSR by the American military aircraft, the deliberate violation of state sovereignty of the USSR and the provocative announcements of the representatives of the government and personally of the President of the US, in which the treacherous, aggressive, spying work of the American militarists was fully justified and made a part of state policy, made the summit meeting impossible. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, N. S. Khrushchev, justly pointed out at a preliminary meeting with the heads of the Western powers on 16 May, that the United States' declaration of such a policy, which can be carried out only when states are in a state of war, doomed the summit meeting in advance. If the Soviet government, under similar conditions, participated in discussions deliberately doomed to failure, it would thus become an accomplice in the deception of the peoples, and public opinion of all countries.

The provocative flights, not by chance undertaken on the eve of the meeting of the heads of state, reflected as in a pool of water the true aims and purposes of the policy of the aggressive imperialistic forces of the USA, their perfidy and treachery. To the accompaniment of sonorous phrases of striving for peace, for the elimination of suspicion between states, these forces take an aggressive course with relation to the countries of socialism, strive anew to heat up the international atmosphere and return mankind to the worst period of the "cold war."

The increase of spying and diversionary activity of the American militarists against the USSR, the encouragement of the militaristic appeals of Adenauer, the conclusion of a new military alliance between the US and Japan, the resistance to a peaceful settlement with Germany and to disarmament -- all these are links in the same chain. This is the reaction of the aggressive forces to the successes in the battle for consolidation of the world, which the people have managed to win thanks to the active and consistent peace-loving policies of the Soviet Union, based on the unprecedentedly growing strength of our country, on the superiority of the forces of peace over the forces of war.

The large victories gained recently by the peace-loving forces, which have caused fury in the camp of the aggressors, are indissolubly linked with the great peace offensive of the Soviet Union, with the great activity of the CPSU, with the selfless and untiring struggle of the head of the Soviet government, the First Secretary of the CC CPSU, N. S. Khrushchev, for peace and for peaceful coexistence of countries with varied social structures. The foreign policy of the Soviet Union finds a firm foundation in the speeches of N. S. Khrushchev. He creatively expands Lenin's ideas, with exceptional persuasiveness discloses the living force of Communist ideology, the great advantages of socialism over capitalism, and the peaceful aims of the peoples of the socialist countries. That is why the speeches of N. S. Khrushchev are extremely interesting, both within our country, and far from its borders. They draw the attention of millions of people of various classes and parties and opinions. They give a clear answer to the most urgent problems of the present day which affect the interests, thoughts, hopes and expectations of millions of people at all the ends of the world. And wherever N. S. Khrushchev speaks: in fraternal Hungary, in friendly Indonesia, or in the citadel of capitalism, the United States of America, he upholds the noble cause of peace, the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism. In his speeches, Comrade N. S. Khrushchev consistently and insistently exposes the policies of the aggressive circles of imperialism, their plans and projects, removes the mask of peaceableness with which, in this new situation, they must cover their policies.

Recently, the State Publishing House for Political Literature, bowing to the many requests of readers, published a collection in two volumes, "Peace without Arms -- Peace without Wars." This collection includes the speeches of N. S. Khrushchev on questions of the foreign policy of the USSR and of international relations, interviews and talks with foreign representatives, which were published by the Soviet press in 1959. It also includes the more important documents of foreign policy of the USSR such as the foreign policy section of the report and the concluding speech of N. S. Khrushchev at the XXI Congress of the CPSU; speeches in connection with the trips of USSR party and state delegations to the Chinese People's Republic, Albania, Poland, Hungary, and the GDR; speeches in connection with the visit to the United States of America, and also in connection with the visit to the USSR of Great Britain's Prime Minister H. Macmillan and others.

The scope of the questions touched on in the speeches of N. S. Khrushchev included in the collection is extraordinarily broad. Here the principles of interrelation of the countries of socialist friendship are analyzed and the growing role of these countries in international affairs is shown, together with the great advantages of socialism over capitalism; a deep, multi-faceted substantiation of the policies of peaceful coexistence and the competition of states with varied social systems, their economic and cultural ties is given; the problems connected with disarmament, the conclusion of a peaceful treaty with Germany, and the normalization of the situation in West Berlin, with the liquidation of all remains of the Second World War, are taken up, and many other things. In the books of

N. S. Khrushchev, the reader will find an elaboration of the most important theoretical and political problem of the possibility of eliminating wars in our time; they show the creative force of Marxism-Leninism as applied to new situations in the development of modern society.

The most important problem of the present day is the problem of peaceful coexistence of countries with various social structures. This problem came up immediately after the victory of the socialist revolution in our country, and took on a particularly urgent character with the transformation of socialism into a world system. The march of historical events, the future of the world and of the liberating struggle of nations depends a great deal on how the interrelationships of the new socialist structure and the out of date capitalist system take shape.

What have been and are the alternatives in the interrelationships between the socialist and capitalist systems? "There can be two ways out," says Comrade N. S. Khrushchev, "either war, and war in this time of rockets and hydrogen bombs is fraught with serious consequences for all nations, or peaceful coexistence." (N. S. Khrushchev. Peace without Arms -- Peace without Wars. Volumes 1 and 2. Gospolitizdat /Gosudarstvennoye izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury -- State Publishing House for Political Literature/, 1960, Vol. 2, p. 45. Further references will be made in the text)

Some have suggested that in the interrelationships between two social systems there is another "third way out": neither war, nor peace, that is the maintenance and even strengthening of international tension in the interrelationships of the states of the two systems. The more reactionary circles of imperialism are trying to maintain the "cold war," conducting a policy of balancing "on the brink of war." They fear that a weakening of international tension, a change toward more relaxation, will lead to the dissolution of the imperialist blocs and to the strengthening of the positions of the democratic peace-loving forces in the whole world.

The hardened enemy of communism, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency of the US, Allen Dulles, writes uneasily that with the weakening of international tension, "the danger of international communism has increased." The slogans "Peace," "Friendship" and "Coexistence," Allen Dulles calls subversive. What are the defenders of the "free world" coming to, if the very word "peace" is a threat to them and their system!

But the attempts to balance "on the brink of war" are pure folly. The "cold war" sooner or later may become a hot war. When the guns are loaded, they "fire themselves." The "third way out" is sheer mockery at the nations which thirst for a stable peace, peace not only today, but tomorrow too, peace forever.

The Soviet Union consistently upholds the idea of peaceful coexistence. This idea was first formulated by Lenin. It permeated the foreign policy of the Soviet state from the moment of its birth and is the guiding star of the powerful Soviet Union, of the whole great socialist camp even now. "We are true to Lenin's ideas, we consistently carry them out, we will do everything to avoid war and to create good relations between nations, between states, regardless of their social structure," says N. S. Khrushchev. (Vol. 1, p. 292.)

Now the idea of peaceful coexistence has received further development with a consideration of the new historical conditions, the new arrangement of forces in the world arena. What does the policy of peaceful coexistence mean under modern conditions? N. S. Khrushchev explains: "In its very simplest expression it means rejection of war as a means of solving debatable questions. Nevertheless this does not fully exhaust the concept of peaceful coexistence. Besides the obligation to refrain from attack, it also predetermines the obligation of all states to not violate the territorial integrity and sovereignty of each other in any form and under any pretext. The principle of peaceful coexistence means the rejection of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries with the aim of changing their state structure or way of life or for some other reason. The doctrine of peaceful coexistence also provides that the political and economic interrelations between countries must be built on the basis of full equality of the parties and mutual benefit." (Vol. 2, p. 46.)

The striving for peace reflects the nature of the socialist society. War and violence are not in accord with the interests, moral principles and aims of the working class and all workers. "An end to wars, peace between nations, the cessation of pillage and violence -- this is our ideal," said V. I. Lenin.

Actually, is it not a fact that in the countries of socialism there are no such classes or social groups who need war, arms races, seizure of foreign territories, just as there is no special military caste removed from the people and opposed to them? The interrelationships of the peoples within the socialist society, just as within the whole friendship of the socialist states, are built on the basis of the principles of internationalism and equality. The Communists believe that there can be no free, happy nation if it oppresses other nations, therefore the enslavement and exploitation of other nations is strange and despicable to them.

The ideology of peace and friendship among nations is responsible for the nature of the international Communist movement.

The enemies of communism try to find an "internal contradiction" between the principle of peaceful coexistence and the struggle of the Marxist-Leninists for the victory of the Communist system in all countries. Consciously confusing questions of the ideological struggle with questions of the interrelationships between states, the apologists of capitalism want to portray Communists as the partisans of aggressive acts. They demand of the USSR guarantees that peaceful coexistence will not lead to the liquidation of capitalism, the proletariat's rejection of the class struggle, the ideological disarmament of communism. It was just in this spirit that the US Vice-president R. Nixon, Secretary of State C. Herter, A. Dulles, and others recently spoke.

But no one will be able to confuse and misconstrue the extremely clear position of the Soviet Union and all socialist countries on questions of peaceful coexistence. Comrade N. S. Khrushchev has frequently explained and substantiated this position, emphasizing that one cannot confuse the problems of the ideological struggle with questions of relations between

states. In the final analysis, noted Comrade N. S. Khrushchev, the idea of communism will win out in the whole world just as it has in our country, in China, and in many other states. For it is only socialism which discloses unprecedentedly promising prospects for the inexhaustable creative upsurge of the masses, for the true flowering of science and culture, for the realization of man's dream of a happy life.

Socialism will win in the course of competition of the two systems, because it is the more progressive system. The Communists' assurance of victory is based on the knowledge of the laws of development of society. Just as in its time capitalism, the more progressive form, replaced feudalism, so capitalism will be replaced by the more progressive and more just social structure -- communism. This is the objective order of history. How can we speak of guarantees of the eternity and stability of capitalism?

In many speeches N. S. Khrushchev considers the question of the correlation of wars and the struggle for social progress. Marxism-Leninism has shown that capitalism will perish as a result of internal contradictions, the struggle of the working class, the masses of people against the exploiting groups. War is not necessary for the revolutionary upsurge of these anti-imperialist forces; imperialist wars are inimicable to the forces of revolution.

It is true that until now it has come about historically that the defection of countries from the capitalist system was connected with world wars. After the First World War the socialist revolution was victorious in the Soviet Union; after the Second World War -- in China and other countries of popular democracy. As Lenin wrote, wars give rise to "world-wide crises of unprecedented force: economic, political, national, and international crises." (Writings, Vol. 23, p. 292.) Wars are fraught with revolutions. And if the imperialists were to risk taking on another world war, it would undoubtedly lead to the collapse of the whole capitalist system. Mankind, says N. S. Khrushchev, will not tolerate a system which condemns millions of people to war, suffering and destruction.

Nevertheless, in this case the victory of the working class over imperialism would be attained at too high a price. Lenin emphasized that war creates "ruin, wildness, torture, calamities in the masses which choke in blood," and this of course cannot but slow down the cause of the proletarian revolution and the building of socialism after its victory. Lenin's thesis is even more true in present-day conditions when a world war would inevitably become a thermonuclear one, and would bring to nations a horrible catastrophe. Therefore the communists of all countries are the bravest, most advanced, most active fighters against an imperialist war.

From the fact that wars engender revolutions it hardly follows that revolution is unthinkable without war. Historical experience, including the experience of post-war times (Iraq, Cuba, many states of Africa, obtaining independence in recent years), convincingly shows: the internal contradictions of imperialism under conditions of peace also inevitably lead to revolutions. And these contradictions deepen and strengthen, especially in connection with the successes of socialism in competition with capitalism,

with the intensification of the national liberation movement. The Communist and workers' parties, working out their tactics, start from the fact that peaceful coexistence opens up the most favorable opportunities for the further strengthening of the successes of socialism, for the uniting in the countries of capitalism of forces struggling against the despised imperialism and militarism, for peace, social progress, for the final aims of the working class.

Thus, violence and imperialist wars contradict the nature of socialism and communism. Peaceful coexistence and competition with capitalism in peaceful pursuits -- this is the policy steadfastly and consistently followed by the Soviet Union and other socialist states. And this is convincingly shown in the two-volume collection of speeches of the head of the Soviet government. Here the reader will find a deep and penetrating substantiation of the thesis of the possibility of a preventive war in modern times.

In his report at the XXI Congress of the CPSU, Comrade N. S. Khrushchev said, "The conclusion made by the XX Congress of the party, that there is no fatal inevitability of war, has been fully justified. Now, we confirm with even greater grounds the truth of this conclusion. Now there are immense forces able to give support to the imperialist aggressors and to defeat them if they start a world war." (Vol. 1, p. 24.) The first secretary of the CC CPSU substantiated the proposition that "before the complete victory of socialism on earth, while maintaining capitalism in part of the world, there is a real possibility of excluding a world war from the life of society." (Vol. 1, p. 25.)

What is the basis of this deep conclusion, this new proposition in Marxist-Leninist science? Has imperialism really changed its nature, voluntarily rejected war? Of course not.

In his report at the XXI Congress of the CPSU, as in other speeches, Comrade Khrushchev warned against underestimating the aggressiveness of reactionary groups of imperialism, their tendency to adventurism, and their natural hatred for communism. He said that while capitalism remains, adventurers will remain, wishing to unleash war; "while capitalism exists, we can always find people who 'in spite of reason' wish to rush into a hopeless undertaking." (Vol. 1, p. 25.)

Inherent in imperialism is a striving for aggression, for seizing territories and markets, for robbing and exploiting nations. Despised by imperialism is the socialist system, Marxist-Leninist teaching, the national liberation and socialist movement of the nations. It seeks a way out of internal crises by preparing for war.

Consistently conducting a course for peaceful coexistence, the government of the USSR takes into consideration the fact that among the ruling groups of the Western countries there are influential groups whose economic and political interests are directly connected with the "cold war," the arms race, and which will in the future oppose in all ways the improvement of the international atmosphere. They strive to maintain and even sharpen the "cold war," to maintain an atmosphere of tension and fear in order to continue

to rob their people with the help of taxes, to continue the arms race, to frighten the workers, to keep them in check, in obedience.

The Soviet Union entertains no illusions with regard to the essence of imperialism. N. S. Khrushchev warns, "...if we say that at the present time there is no fatal inevitability of war, this does not at all mean that we can rest on our laurels, fold our hands and bask in the sun, hoping that we are done with war for once and for all. Those in the West who think that war is profitable for them have not yet changed their minds. In their hands are concentrated considerable material forces, military and political levers, and no one is assured that one tragic day they may try to put them into action. It is the more necessary to continue an active struggle to make the policy of peaceful coexistence victorious in the whole world, not in words, but in deeds." (Vol. 2, p. 53.)

A question arises: what is the basis of our firm belief in the possibility of preventing wars in our time? Are there not here any false hopes dulling the vigilance of the people? Unconditionally not. The socialist concept of peaceful coexistence is based on a deep and penetrating analysis of all the facts of modern life. Such an analysis was given at the XX and XXI Congresses of the CPSU, at congresses of fraternal parties, in the Moscow Declaration of the Conference of Representatives of Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries.

The main thing in this analysis is the idea of a new balance of forces in the world arena. It is just their new arrangement, the preponderance of peace-loving forces, which gives grounds to believe that there is not now the fatal inevitability of new wars, that they can be prevented and that we can make real progress in the field of disarmament, and also in other international problems. What are these forces?

Comrade N. S. Khrushchev writes: "Firstly, in our day peace is strived for not only by all socialist states, but by many states of Asia and Africa which are on the road to development of independent national statehood, and many other states not included in the aggressive military blocs.

"Secondly, the policy of peace finds powerful support from the broad masses of people throughout the whole world.

"Thirdly, the peace-loving socialist states have very impressive material means, which cannot but have a restraining influence on the aggressors." (Vol. 2, p. 51-52.)

In our day the socialist countries occupy about one-fourth of the territory of the earth and account for a third of the world population. The industrial products produced by the states of the socialist camp comprises about one-third of the world production. When the USSR becomes the first industrial power of the world, when the Chinese People's Republic becomes a powerful industrial power, and all the socialist countries will together produce more than half of the world's industrial products, the international situation will change radically. The successes of the countries of the socialist camp undoubtedly will have a great effect on the strengthening of the peace-loving forces in the whole world. By then, the states in favor

of consolidation will be joined by new countries liberated from the colonial yoke. The idea of the inadmissibility of war will be even more deeply rooted in the conscience of the people. The new correlation of forces in favor of socialism will be sufficiently evident that the hopelessness of any attempt to set the fire of a new war will be clear to even the most hardheaded imperialists.

The change in the correlation of forces in the international arena as a result of the growth of power of the socialist camp even now calls forth demarcation in the ruling circles of the imperialist states. The position of many representatives of these circles is greatly influenced by the fact that even for them it is becoming ever more obvious what kind of catastrophes would be the result of a new war with the application of modern forms of arms. The more far-seeing bourgeois politicians cannot but realize what conclusions will be made by the people with relation to the system which wants to unleash such a war.

In his announcement of 16 May of this year in Paris, Comrade N. S. Khrushchev again emphasized: The Soviet Government is deeply convinced that if not this government of the USA, then another, if not another, then a third, will understand that there is no alternative except peaceful co-existence of the two systems: capitalist and socialist.

The socialist concept of peaceful coexistence presupposes the active work of the Soviet Union and socialist countries to expose the enemies of peaceful coexistence, to wreck the plans of the reactionary militaristic forces, and it demands the mobilization of world public opinion against them. This holds the pledge that it will be possible decisively to weaken international tension, and by overcoming the resistance of the militaristic, aggressive circles, to achieve the following: to reach a solution for concrete problems in order to consolidate the world and to impose peace even on its most inveterate enemies.

"Before us stand many unsolved international problems," says Comrade N. S. Khrushchev. "But there is one problem whose solution is awaited with hope by the people of all countries, both large and small, regardless of their social relations and way of life. This is the problem of disarmament." (Vol. 2, p. 153.)

The most radical and true way to prevent new world slaughter and to exclude war from the life of society for eternity is shown in the program for general complete disarmament, as set forth by N. S. Khrushchev in the name of the government of the USSR at a meeting of the UN General Assembly. If no state has any army or arms, negotiations inevitably will become the only means of solving even the most critical questions. General and total disarmament will make it possible to remove from the path of the negotiations on disarmament such a stumbling block as the "problem of control" which for many years has been used by the western powers to wreck the negotiations. "If disarmament will be general and total," said N. S. Khrushchev, returning to this question at the last session of the Supreme

Soviet of the USSR, "then on it can be established a control just as total and complete because then no one will need to keep any secrets from other states."

Why does the Soviet Union so resolutely and persistently struggle for disarmament? For a long time some in the West were inclined to consider this a sign of weakness of our country or as propaganda. Such an evaluation can be formed only under the influence of the reactionary propaganda, which is trying to pervert the humane essence of the socialist system, as a result of measuring the policies of the new proletarian state with the old imperialist measure. For the imperialists, everything is decided by force. They consider violence as the basis of interrelationships between states, between large and small countries, between the mother countries and the colonies; the strengthening of power of one or another imperialist power has led to the overdistribution of foreign markets and spheres of influence, to imperialist wars for the division of the world. It is a fact that when the US created the first atomic bomb, the American ruling circles immediately claimed world supremacy.

The Soviet Union suggests that the states disarm totally within a definite time, first of all because this meets the great humanistic principles of socialism, the deep-rooted interests of all nations. In distinction to the imperialist state which uses armament and armed forces both for conducting aggressive policies externally, and for fulfilling internal functions -- keeping in check and suppressing the exploited classes -- socialism does not know these two main stimuli which give birth to militarism. It is natural that under the conditions of military intervention and the subsequent aggressive policy of the West, our country cannot begin to liquidate the army. Nevertheless, this remains one of the ideals of socialism.

"Peace" was the first word with which the offspring of the October Revolution appeared in the world. In 1922, at a conference in Genoa, the Soviet delegation, fulfilling the directives of V. I. Lenin, announced its intention to "recommend a complete cessation of armament and to support all suggestions which have the aim of lightening the burden of militarism." The Soviet recommendations at the International Conference on Disarmament in the first half of the 30's were dictated by a striving for peace and for international, especially European, security. And today, when the advantages of the USSR in decisive fields of military technology are indisputable, the first socialist state, in the person of the head of its government, again gives the challenge: "Let us fully disarm!"

Disarmament is the main link in strengthening peaceful coexistence; it is a question on which in the most direct manner depend war and peace, and therefore the fate of millions of people. Under the conditions of an arms race there can be no full assurance that one or another group of adventurers of the imperialist camp would not undertake a new military adventure; and the greater quantity of arms it has, the more actual is the threat. Further, on the strength of some absurd chance, such as damage in the control of an aircraft carrying a hydrogen bomb, or a disturbance in the normal mental state of the pilot sitting at the controls, war could become a reality.

Disarmament is especially necessary in connection with the character which a world war with modern weapons would assume. It would lead to the destruction of dozens and even hundreds of millions of human lives, to the ruination of thousands of cities and industrial centers, to the destruction of the greatest monuments of culture, which have been created by centuries of effort by human genius. This war would spare not even the future generations: its poisonous traces in the form of radioactive contamination would maim people for a long time, would take away many lives.

Disarmament would free additional means for the better satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of the people, which is the main concern of the Communist and workers' parties and the governments of the socialist states. It would reflect itself in the position of the workers of the capitalist countries, where the result of the arms race is an increase of prices and taxes, and a decrease of true wages. Disarmament would create new opportunities to assist the economically underdeveloped countries.

Finally, disarmament would give back to peaceful production great masses of people (the total for all countries exceeds 100 million persons) and tremendous funds (on the order of 100 billion dollars a year). A great quantity of human energy, knowledge, inventiveness, and skill is falling today into a bottomless barrel, as it is absorbed by growing armament production. "Is it not time," says N. S. Khrushchev, "to finish with this senseless waste of the people's funds, the people's energy, for the purpose of preparing for war and for destruction." (Vol. 2, p. 155.)

Here are the peace-loving and humane precepts guiding the Communist Party and Soviet Government, conducting a course for disarmament. Communists are convinced that mankind can live without wars, and therefore without the arms and armed forces necessary for military action. The imperialists in all ways hinder the solution of the problem of disarmament. And at the same time their reactionary propaganda slanders us, calling Communists a "destructive force," and hooting about the "Soviet threat." Where is the logic there? And who will believe that the "aggressive, destructive force" persistently and consistently conducts a course for disarmament, carries out a one-sided reduction of the army, makes a challenge to dump into the sea the existing means of armament, to disband the army and the military staffs, while the "peace-loving" forces are against this?

The contrast of the two courses -- of socialism and of imperialism -- is clearly seen in the approach to the problem of a peaceful settlement with Germany. The course of the socialist countries stems from a realistic evaluation and appeals to reason, recommending the more effective methods of solution. Imperialism is guided by reactionary illusions of the reversibility of the social-historical process, it counts on violence, it tries to maintain the remains of war.

The speeches and reports of N. S. Khrushchev analyze in detail the situation in the Federal Republic of Germany and West Berlin, graphically and convincingly disclose the connection between the problem of a peaceful settlement with Germany and European security. Twice in the first half of the twentieth century German imperialism set off world wars. Now everyone

sees the new military preparations in the Federal Republic. The bundeswehr is growing. The West German militarists are longing for atomic weapons, the soldiers of the bundeswehr are already being taught to carry on an atomic war. West Berlin has become a knot of contradictions, fraught with dangerous consequences.

Bonn has clearly not adjusted to its defeat in the past war and is nurturing new robbers' plans. Chancellor Adenauer conducts a militaristic policy, the policy of the German revanchists; he has become one of the main pillars of the "cold war," one of the main adherents of the "policy of force." The situation is aggravated by the fact that West Germany appears in the world arena not alone, but in the framework of the military North Atlantic bloc. It plays a primary role in this bloc. Therefore, as Comrade N. S. Khrushchev explains, it is not at all impossible that West Germany, using its position in the North Atlantic Union, could provoke a war, draw into it its allies, and plunge the whole world into the abyss of a destructive war (see Vol. 2, p. 56.)

The cardinal solution of the German question is the conclusion of a peace treaty with the two existing German states -- the GDR and the FRG -- and the solution on this basis of the question of West Berlin, emphasizes N. S. Khrushchev. It is just this which makes up the basis of the Soviet approach to the problem of a peaceful settlement with Germany: a full account of the actual situation, an attempt to combine a guarantee of the rights of the German nation, its full sovereignty, the possibilities of peaceful democratic development of the country, with the necessary measures for maintaining the security of the nations and world in Europe. The conclusion of a peaceful treaty with Germany would create a stable, lawful order, would knock the props out from under the West German revanchists, would free the German people from foreign occupation and would permit the German people to solve all questions of domestic and foreign policy.

In the same way the idea of turning West Berlin into a free demilitarized city is, under present conditions, the most humane and peace-loving solution. Only in this case can the abnormal situation be liquidated, when in the center of one of the states there are troops of other countries, and at the same time can the economic and political institutes and orders existing in West Berlin be untouched, its economic connections be not violated.

Wanting to spoil the conclusion of a peaceful treaty and to interfere with the normalization of the situation in West Berlin, some statesmen of the Western countries, as for example, US Secretary of State Herter, again suggest that the problem of unification of Germany be solved first.

What would the attempt of the great powers to solve the problem of reunification of Germany really mean? It would be a forced intervention in the internal affairs of the two German states. The Western powers apparently think, said N. S. Khrushchev, that they will be able to impose their will on us, and that this will help them to liquidate the socio-economic achievements of the Germans in the German Democratic Republic. They want us, apparently, to apply some kind of force, since we know that the Germans of the German Democratic Republic will not voluntarily give up their

achievements. Can the Western powers really think that the Soviet Union would be their accomplice in the dirty deed of liquidating what has been accomplished by the progressive forces of the German Democratic Republic? (see Vol. 1, p. 111.)

The Soviet course in the question of the peaceful settlement with Germany meets with growing support of the popular masses and the peace-loving public of all countries because it embodies the only proper, just and reasonable approach to this immediate problem. If the ruling circles of the western powers continue in the future to sabotage its solution, if they hope that a refusal to sign a peace treaty will let them keep their occupation rights in West Berlin, these calculations are built on sand. After a peace treaty with the GDR is signed, N. S. Khrushchev again emphasized during his 11 May press conference with Soviet and foreign journalists, the occupation of West Berlin will be ended; the GDR will then be fully in control over its territory, and also over access to West Berlin which is located on its territory.

The Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet government are exerting every effort so that relations between socialist and capitalist states may flow in the stream of peaceful coexistence. This could to a considerable degree be helped by the activization of economic, scientific-technical and cultural ties. In many speeches, N. S. Khrushchev emphasizes the importance of a broad, mutually beneficial trade exchange between the states of various social systems, the necessity of eliminating every discrimination in this field; he points out the connection between international trade and the problem of peaceful coexistence. He particularly notes that "economic ties create good premises for strengthening political relations between countries." (Vol. 1, p. 157.)

A very important role in strengthening faith, better mutual understanding of states and nations, and therefore in strengthening peace, is played by personal contacts of the leaders of the countries of various systems. This is explained by the fact that the head of the Soviet government, with his usual energy and tirelessness, has undertaken lately a series of visits to the countries of the West and East. All peace-loving mankind has hailed the trips of N. S. Khrushchev to the United States, France, the countries of Southeast Asia, seeing them as steps toward weakening international tension.

Peaceful coexistence does not mean bridges built between two systems. "Of course such coexistence of states with different social systems," explains Comrade N. S. Khrushchev, "presupposes that they both must make concessions in the interests of peace. We may say that there is required a realistic approach, a sober evaluation of the actual state of affairs, mutual understanding, and a consideration for the interests of each other." (Vol. 2, p. 347-348.) And this is understandable, for otherwise it is impossible to create normal relations between states with different interests. Nevertheless, such a policy is conceivable only under two indispensable conditions: first, concessions cannot touch on principles -- the questions of ideology. Comrade Khrushchev emphasizes that "we cannot mix mutual

concessions in the interests of peaceful coexistence of states with concessions in principles, in what touches on the very nature of our socialist structure, our ideology. Here there can be no talk of concessions and accommodation. If there were concessions in principles and in questions of ideology, this would mean slipping down to the position of our adversaries. This would mean a qualitative change in policy and would be treacherous to the cause of the working class." (Vol. 2, p. 350.) And, second, concessions must be mutual, and directed at consolidating peace.

Recent events, especially the gangster flights of American military aircraft over the Soviet Union, have shown that the imperialist circles have not rejected their hopes of forcing the Soviet Union to make one-sided concessions. But this is an empty, foolish hope. The Soviet Union does not beg the imperialists for peace. Its position, the position of the whole socialist camp, is stable as it has never been before. The socialist countries are achieving more and more new successes in all fields of life; their superiority over the capitalistic countries grows day by day. The peace-loving policy of the USSR is dictated not by its weakness, but by its strength, its positiveness that these nations can restrain the militarists and aggressors. Having fully exposed the reactionary circles of the US who undermined the meeting of heads of state, N. S. Khrushchev again emphasized in his announcement of 16 May that the Soviet Government will in the future do everything possible to help relax international tension, being guided in this by the interests of consolidating peace on the basis of peaceful coexistence of states with different social structures.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union, as the materials of the two-volume edition of works of N. S. Khrushchev again clearly show, is extremely clear. This is a policy of peace and friendship among peoples; it is dictated by the most humane moral principles which are in line with the nature of the socialist structure. This is an active, new, creative policy worked out with a consideration of the real situation in the world, of all factors of international life. This is a flexible policy, combining firmness in the support of principles, and preparedness to make reasonable compromises in the interests of peace. This is a truly democratic foreign policy, which is conducted openly and straightforwardly. There is nothing higher and more noble than the aims of this policy. "The aim of our domestic policy -- the only aim and the main one -- is to create a life worthy of the best ideals of mankind," says Comrade N. S. Khrushchev. "The aim of our foreign policy -- the only aim and unchangeable one -- is to prevent war, provide peace and security for our own country and for all countries." (Vol. 1, p. 237.) This is why the Soviet Union is the main support and hope of all peace-loving peoples. And the imperialism of the United States has become for all the world the enemy of progressive mankind!